

**Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant  
(SPF SIG)  
Draft MINUTES  
Advisory Council Meeting  
Conference Center Room B  
November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006**

Attendees: Mark Frisbie, Kim Manlove serving as proxy for Billie Breaux, John Viernes, Jr., Hal Thompson, Tammy Loew, Mary Lay, Sonya Cleveland, Laura Coykendall, Jeanette Grissom, Bob Levy, Jeff Barber, Dennis Wichern, Dean Babcock, Gary Williams, Louise Anderson, Sheila Nesbitt, Celia Leaird, Cathy Boggs, Karla Sneegeas proxy-Anita Gaillard, Carl Ellison for Nancy Jewell, Marcia French, Mike Kramer, Albert Gay serving proxy for Heather McCarthy, Jim Noffsinger, Paula Parker-Sawyer, Matt Strittmatter, David Bozell, Harold Kooreman, Chandonna Saba, Martha Payne, Eric Wright, Neal Holtan, and Casandra Porter with Celia Leaird.

**WELCOME**

Chair Mark Frisbie, welcomed all to the council and called the meeting to order. He apologized for being so busy with the election and having had to miss past meetings and requested that the Council hold sidebar conversations and write suggestions of topics down to submit to the 'Parking Lot' for discussion of the entire Council. An introduction and of each voting member was completed.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the September GAC meeting were presented, but no quorum was present for approval. One correction was the name of 'Center for Health Policy'.

**Strategic Plan Submission Update**

Kim Manlove reported the plan has been submitted and is now under review. He stated he has received recommendations for plan adjustments and is incorporating them as they come in. Kim expressed his thanks for all the suggestions and stated if there are any other suggestions to please feel free to continue emailing them to him for review. The hope is the plan will be approved, then will be presented to the Executive Committee next month and then brought before the GAC.

**UPDATES**

**Project Staffing**

Kim Manlove informed the council that he received the approval to hire the third person for the SPF SIG staff,

the Administrative Assistant and we are still awaiting word on CSAP Project Officer (PO) for Indiana.

### **SEOW REPORT**

Eric Wright reported on the process establishing the Priorities for the state of Indiana. He also stated that the charge for the SEOW was to list and analyze the data, determine the priorities as dictated by the data and lay the foundation for potential applicants of the grant. He explained that with the way the strategic plan is laid out that any applicant has the opportunity to chose from any or all of the 6 identified priorities and create a case to support their application, or focus on proving the need for building capacity. Each individual county will have access to all the data that the Epi-report has, in addition to maps and tables, and in addition is encouraged to look within their community to enhance and make the argument for being a sub-recipient. The burden of proving the case will be laid upon each community applying.

Paula asked if a community would be penalized if they didn't use the Epi-Profile data.

Eric explained that would not be the case and that the communities were strongly encouraged to provide other local data to support their assessments. He emphasized the importance of demonstrating their case with imperial data and evidence.

Tammy asked if it was ok to share the Epi-report with others and are the legislators being given copies of the report.

The report is a public document and can be shared with anyone, although there are a limited number of copies printed. Eric suggested the website of the Center of Health Policy as the referral source. She also asked about line within his report that were blank and he responded that they were typos and it is still a work under construction and hyperlinks will be included.

Louise asked if there are no indicators in the boxes does this indicate that the counties fall below the 50 percentile. Eric indicated to the affirmative.

Bob asked if it would be possible to color code county maps. That this is provided with maps and tables.

Jeff asked if the communities would be receiving assistance in gathering data beyond that provided in the report.

Eric stated that the PRC was a resource they could use but he and his team would not be available to assist each community in tracking data.

Eric also shared that in terms of unit of analysis they focused on counties and were not able to include individual towns or smaller units. It was purposely vague so each community could self define. He stated that a strategy for communities will be to encourage them to follow the same logic the SEOW did, find the data and make a case for the community. He suggested that the community start with the consequence and work backwards as they work the SPF process.

Mike Kramer suggested that one area of difficulty will be that there is a huge variation from county to county in data resources and this will leave for strong limitations, but acknowledged doesn't know how that problem could be dealt with.

Eric agreed and stated one of the beauties of the SPF process is it helps identify weaknesses and works towards moving to evidence-based problems and solutions. Low capacity communities will struggle more and when an expert panel was polled they identified 2/3 of the counties were low capacity. One of the main purposes of this grant is to address that and build the capacity within the state. He also explained that they will be taking a sampling of key informants within communities to do annual assessments. There are two views of capacity; community readiness and organizational readiness and they are going to focus on overall capacities of communities.

Eric concluded with apologizing for the typos in the report and then asking that people hold off distributing the report until it is cleaned up.

Mark shared that it is expected the numbers will change due to increased data submissions-emphasizing that with an increase in awareness, it is possible to perceive that we're doing a less effective job, but the reality is that increasing awareness has the ability to increase the reporting even if progress is being made and numbers are decreasing.

Eric shared this to be true and that it is important to remember a lag time is also an issue in reviewing data and the validity to it. Every data source has its weaknesses and strengths and there is no perfect data. The best results come from using multiple indicators which will lead to greater confidence with regards to validity. Drug trends are cyclical and we need to be flexible.

#### **Finance Workgroup**

John Viernes reported that there was a \$128.00 charge for payroll deduction that was not clear and he would

investigate this and report back. He also reported the charge of \$16,500 that will be reported on the next report for the printing of the SEOW reports. The first copies printed will need a logo attached representing FSSA. The new copies have that already printed on. A concern was raised by Bob how expensive the second set of copies ran. John reported it was reported that the state required they be copied by the contracting printer of the state, or state resources.

#### **Evaluation Workgroup**

Bob Levy began his report by circulating a survey the Executive Committee had endorsed and wanted to bring it forth for the approval of the GAC. He asked that all complete the evaluation survey before leaving and that all surveys were anonymous. Bob explained that Harold would write a synopsis and each report will be shared with the chair of the committee, as well as a quarterly report that will be circulated to the GAC and Mark Frisbie. Please complete the survey and give to Marcia. The workgroup will also be reviewing the Strategic Plan at the next meeting. An organizational chart is being created with the 5 SPF steps and sustainability and Cultural Competency being cross examined. An analysis on how well each group is interrelating and communicating will be reviewed. An acknowledgment of Sheila Nesbitt leaving for maternity leave was made and appreciation for all her efforts and introduction of Neal Holtan taking her place was announced.

#### **Training and Outreach Workgroup**

Paula reported the workgroup has met four times since the last GAC meeting. They have orchestrated an aggressive work plan and timetable. She reported they would be meeting next week with Access Indiana to create a webpage for SPF SIG, and are working on a website design. They are also looking at training materials for specific organizational and community levels. Translation concerns are also being researched to address Cultural Competency issues.

The workgroup has identified a need for a logo and Martha has made a few options for a logo for the SPF SIG, which will be presented to Dennis Rosebrough for approval. Please feel free to email comments or concerns to Paula or Marcia.

Starting December 31<sup>st</sup> a monthly newsletter will be distributed on line to keep people informed on the progress of the SPF SIG Project.

Identifying the focuses of the TOT and reserving dates and locations for conferences is also well underway. January 29<sup>th</sup> has been tentatively scheduled for the first meeting predicated upon the approval of the Strategic Plan.

The website will be no longer than 2 pages with news, short stories and links. An opportunity will be made available for those communities who don't have computer access to be faxed copies.

Marcia is organizing a meeting to coordinate efforts for the assessment tools to assist communities in identifying capacity levels.

Please review the work plan and feel free to email Paula or Marcia to share identified areas of concern.

The T/O Workgroup are meeting weekly to make certain all things are getting addressed in a timely and aggressive manner.

#### **Grant Review Workgroup**

Mark reported that he was responsible for getting this workgroup up and running. He shared that the DOA requires that the group be state employees for scoring members. He suggested that we pull from both the GAC and the Governor's Commission for Drug Free Indiana and ascertained that the members of state employees were the same for both organizations; John von Arx, Paula Parker-Sawyers and Jeff Barber. He is looking to have about 7 reviewers and stated the GAC will make the final decision on recipients. University employees can sit on the workgroup but wouldn't be able to score the applications. Paula offered her staff that have expertise in knowing what to look for and do this often. A recommendation was made to split the reviews between capacity building reviews and program implementation reviews. It was mentioned that the federal grants are required to follow the logic model and the skill sets of that are vital to know how to review logic model processes, those organizations that are currently skilled in that area are FSSA, FBO, and State Department of Health. Mark will be creating a core group and please email Mark concerns. One shared concern was that the core group being organized from other organizations was not the most beneficial way to ensure competency levels and fidelity to the SPF SIG Process. Mark agreed the SPF SIG process was of vital concern but that we needed to also be attentive to building bridges of dialogue and working collaboratively with others.

Also we discussed the number of anticipated respondents and one number offered at the SEOW was about 80, the first SIG

reported they only had 17. Jeff asked that the role of the workgroup be identified prior to the members being selected.

A recommendation of the by-laws being amended to accommodate for this workgroups organization and charge be considered.

### **Granting Process Discussion**

Kim reported that at the past Executive Committee meeting a request was made to review several different options for the Grant Process Review. Kim reported that after reviewing dialogue with Jessica Robertson, from the DOA, and Jason Hutchens suggestions that he reviewed all the advantages and disadvantages available. Kim's recommendation was to follow an RFS process. The RFS reflexes ability for the GAC to have more control over the process. It would put it in our court whether to decide to have a pre-bid conference, and decisions dealing with MBWBE and Buy Indiana. Paula mentioned that the T/O Workgroup had discussed this as well and felt it would be of great advantage to offer bonus points in the area of Minority and Women run businesses to not circumvent issues but to address all components that would be of benefit to the communities. Kim stated that using the RFS would give flexibility to deal with issues of this very nature. It was reported that we would follow the format of the RFP, taking advantage of the definitions and clauses that protected the grant allocation processes. Kim reported that the comment from CSAP that the staff was adhering strongly to was to make sure all activities were transparent and there were no concerns of anything being done underhandedly. A concern raised was to whether the dollar amount on the allocations would be changed and if the time frame would change. Kim stated no to the amount being changed based on the use of the RFS and that time would be saved. He also indicated that the contracting of the grants would not be altered but remained in the hands of the DOA and would be a multi-month process. Paula suggested that getting the core contract approved would save time in that area.

### **Announcements**

There were no announcements offered up from the floor.

### **MEETING SCHEDULE**

The next meeting was announced to be January 23<sup>rd</sup> in the Indiana Government Center South in Conference Room 19, between 1 and 4pm.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Mark Frisbie.